

City of San José
Coyote Valley Specific Plan

DRAFT
Summary of North and Mid-Coyote
Property Owners Meeting
January 31, 2008
Coyote Creek Golf Club

Task Force Members Present

Chuck Butters and Ken Saso.

City Staff and Other Public Agencies Present

Sal Yakubu (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Jared Hart (PBCE), Stefanie Hom (PBCE), Regina Mancera (PBCE), and Perihan Ozdemir (PBCE).

Consultants Present

Roger Shanks (Dahlin Group), Jim Musbach (EPS), and Bill Wagner (HMH Engineers).

Property Owners and Community Members Present (Additional people were present; however, the names below only reflect individuals who identified themselves on the sign-up sheet.)

Frank Giancola, Bob Andrews, Darlene Campbell, Ray Williams, Lil Ruscitto, Paul Ruscitto, Pete Benson, Aki Yamashita, Maralee Potter, Sandy Rojas, Jerry Hoefling, Kiley R, Richard Desmet, Rick Linquist, Jack Kuzia, Roger Costa, Vic Lobue, Bob G., Jerry Upshall, Gary, and Rayna.

1. Welcome and Introductions – Sal Yakubu, Principal Planner with the City of San Jose Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement

Sal Yakubu welcomed everyone and introduced staff and the consultants and explained what the purpose of the plan refinements and that staff has been working on plan refinement concepts for the last few months. Tonight's meeting is to obtain comments from the property owners. A summary of the comments will be provided to the Task Force as soon as possible.

2. CVSP Plan Refinements – Sal Yakubu and Roger Shanks with Dahlin Group

A vote was taken on the three concepts presented. A show of hands indicated that all property owners and community members present favored concept #1; there were no votes for either concept #2 or #3.

The property owners and community provided the following comments and questions:

- What would happen at the intersection of Palm Avenue and Monterey Road? *Roger indicated that Palm Avenue would not go over Monterey Road. All of the current at-grade crossings across Monterey Road would be terminated, and there would only be under or over passes.*
- The interchange on Bailey Avenue is shown on the south-side on plan, but the existing interchange is located on the north-side. *Bill Wagner, with HMM Engineers, indicated that the Plan concept shows the reconfiguration of the grade separations at Bailey Avenue. The current interim ramp is located on the north-side, but would be relocated to the south-side.*
- Would the land from the existing interchange on the south-side go back to property owner when it is reconfigured on the north? *Yes.*
- Has the decisions regarding the future high speed rail had an impact on CV? *Sal indicated that there is enough public right-of-way to include the high speed rail.*
- Where would the high speed rail be located? *Bill indicated that the Specific Plan has always envisioned room for high speed rail. The rail alignments would be reconfigured.*
- Would there be a sound impact from the high speed rail? *Bill indicated that issue would need to be addressed by the high speed rail program.*
- Are the plan refinements a result of Cisco and Sobrato's existing entitlements? *Sal indicated that the plan refinements address several issues, including comments received on the EIR, public input, and a continuing effort to make plan implementable and financially feasible. Coyote Valley Research Park (CVRP) and Sobrato hold existing entitlements, and Staff is looking at different alternatives to address how they would transition into the Specific Plan if they decide to develop according to their existing entitlements.*
- When do the existing entitlements expire? *Sal indicated that zonings do not expire, unless the property is rezoned. The Development Agreement between the City and CVRP will be in place until 2020.*
- What is the time frame of the Plan? *Sal indicated that the Task Force would wrap up at the end of this year. The project would go to the Planning Commission and City Council for consideration in the first quarter of 2009.*
- Does Sobrato's property have existing entitlements? *Sal indicated that the properties in North Coyote are part of the North Coyote Valley Campus Industrial Park. Some properties have conventional zonings, Sobrato and IBM have Planned Development (PD) zonings, and CVRP and Cisco have entitlements and a Development Agreement with the City.*
- What would give Sobrato the right to push the proposed lake onto other people's properties? *Sal indicated the plan refinements are just concepts. But Sobrato has a PD zoning, which entitles the development of a certain amount of square feet of workplace use. Conventional zonings do not entitle specific development.*

- One of the concepts is going back to where we were before the CVSP process started, with industrial in North Coyote, and residential in Mid Coyote. Would the CVSP overlap with the General Plan Update effort? The triggers need to be addressed. The existing industrial entitlements are going to develop if the CVSP is not completed fast enough. *Sal indicated that CVRP holds existing entitlements and they can actually build today. But the CVRP plans are not efficient, so staff is trying to come up with frame work that would help them transition into the Specific Plan. A General Plan is a blueprint for the City, while specific plans are more detailed. The CVSP would be completed before the San Jose Envision 2040 General Plan Update.*
- Is there coordination between the General Plan Update and the CVSP? *Sal indicated staff is coordinating within the department, however they are different processes. Some studies conducted for the CVSP would be used for the General Plan Update process.*
- The high school should not be located on the lake. Most residents would be located in South Coyote Valley. It would make more sense to locate the high school to the south to deter traffic, and to put high rises near the lake. *Sal indicated the Plan initially included one 60-acre high school in the core to serve as a focal point of the community and to allow students to take advantage of the in-valley transit. Concept #3 is now the only plan with a high school fronting the lake. A high school campus located in south would also be too close to Ann Sobrato High School.*
- The CVSP was supposed to be built “from scratch”. But now there are existing entitlements. Need to give CVRP “carrots” to make them come back to CVSP.
- The CVRP paid for a portion of the Bailey Avenue interchange that they would be reimbursed for. Would the residual costs fall on other property owners? *Jim Musbach, with EPS, indicated that CVRP already has financing in place for the infrastructure bond, and that would be incorporated into CVSP. If CVRP conforms to CVSP, then CVRP would need to pay higher levels of assessment. If CVRP develops their entitlements, then the values would be reallocated, but with similar cost burdens, so there should not be any impact on other land users.*
- When would the Palm Avenue interchange be closed-off? *Bill indicated it would not be closed-off until the grade separation to the north is built.*
- Are there funds involved to close the Palm Avenue interchange? *Bill indicated there is potential to obtain grant funds to assist with the cost of building a separated crossing, when it is combined with the closure of an at-grade crossing. But it is a competitive process.*
- How many acres are lost in concept #1? *Staff will research that.*
- The best plan refinement is the one that is most similar to the original plan.
- What is the time frame for annexation of properties in Coyote Valley? *Sal indicated that most of North Coyote Valley and some properties in Mid Coyote Valley are already annexed into the City. Annexation of the rest of the properties would happen after the City Council has acted on the Specific Plan. Typically it will happen about one year later.*
- Would there be pre-zoning? *Sal indicated that pre-zoning is going to be part of Specific Plan process. Zoning would be done before annexation.*
- Would the existing residential properties located at Lantz Avenue be affected by the annexation process? *Sal indicated all properties in Mid Coyote Valley would be annexed.*
- What is the process for pre-zoning properties? Would staff meet with each property owner beforehand? *Sal indicated that staff has done extensive outreach within the past five years.*

Staff has worked with property owners to ensure that the proposed land use designations are consistent with existing uses.

- Would property owners be consulted regarding the proposed land uses on their property? *Sal indicated that staff met with some property owners at the beginning of the Specific Plan process, and would be glad to address others concerns. There is no requirement to conform to the Specific Plan, and existing land uses can remain. But if a property owner wanted to develop in the future, they would need to be consistent with the Specific Plan.*
- Would the existing residential properties at Lantz Avenue be affected with higher densities to meet housing goals? *Roger indicated the existing residential units on Lantz Avenue do not contribute to the housing numbers. Sal added that some property owners in that area are interested in intensifying density, so there is an option to do that. But there is no requirement to make changes.*
- Which plan concept does CVRP and Sobrato favor? *Sal indicated they have seen the concepts, but they have not favored one. They like the direction the plan concepts are going.*
- What is happening at Bailey Avenue and Santa Teresa right now? *Bill indicated that CVRP holds regulatory permits to build improvements to Fisher Creek. There is no further construction planned in 2008.*
- Likes concept #1; it is the most similar to the original plan. The configuration of concept #3 looks like Los Angeles.
- Concept #3 has a canal running through existing residential properties. *Roger indicated it is just a concept. But Staff needs to look at alternatives. The concepts are still being refined.*
- Has Staff looked at where existing buildings are located to realize the impacts the plan? *Roger indicated that they know where all existing buildings are. Staff has looked at aerials.*
- Is the Santa Clara County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) involved with the CVSP process? *Sal indicated that LAFCO is represented on the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). Staff has had meetings with them, and more are planned in the future. Most of their comments were regarding agricultural mitigation.*
- Is LAFCO a small group? *Sal indicated that LAFCO is a commission, which some of the City Council Members sit on. There are not a lot of LAFCO staff members, but they play important roles.*

3. Next Steps/Close – Sal Yakubu

Sal thanked everyone for coming. There will be a community meeting on Thursday, February 7, 2008, from 6:30 – 8:30 p.m. at Coyote Creek Golf Club, and a Task Force meeting on Monday, February 11, 2008, from 5:30 – 7:30 p.m. at City Hall. Those meetings will discuss the same topic discussed at tonight's meeting.

The property owners and community provided the following comment:

- Encouraged property owners to attend Task Force meetings.

S:\CVSP Mtgs_TASKFORCE\Meeting Summary\TF_61_02.11.07\Task Force_Meeting#61_1 31 08_Property Owners Meeting.doc